

CD-1 Rezoning: 1110-1160 West King Edward Avenue - Oppose

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-18	16:25	CD-1 Rezoning: 1110-1160 West King Edward Avenue	Oppose	Rezoning five of the seven houses to build a six-storey building, while leaving two small houses in place, destroys the integrity and cohesion of the block. It makes the whole area feel unbalanced and poorly planned.”	Yaochen Zheng		
2025-06-19	16:41	CD-1 Rezoning: 1110-1160 West King Edward Avenue	Oppose	<p>This proposal would rezone the site from R1-1 to CD-1 to permit a six-storey, 169-unit community care facility with a floor space ratio of 3.4 and a building height of nearly 92 feet. While I fully support thoughtful, inclusive development and recognize the need for seniors’ care in our city, this application is not an example of balanced or appropriate growth. Let me explain why.</p> <p>First, the height and density are completely out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. This section of West King Edward is made up of two-storey, single-family homes, and low-rise buildings. Jumping from the current 0.7 FSR and 11.5-meter height limit to a 3.4 FSR and 28 meters is simply too drastic. The proposed building would tower over adjacent homes, block sunlight, and cast long shadows onto yards and gardens. It would strip away privacy, with dozens of windows looking directly into neighboring properties—including bedroom windows. This is not sensitive infill; this is overreach.</p> <p>And it’s not just visual impact. The development would result in the removal of 29 mature trees, which currently provide shade, cooling, and ecological value. Their loss would significantly disrupt the microclimate in the immediate area—worsening the heat island effect and making our homes less livable, especially during extreme heat events. There will also be light pollution from security and hallway lighting, building exhaust, and vehicle fumes from the underground parkade—just feet from family homes.</p> <p>Second, traffic and parking impacts have been grossly underestimated. A facility of this size will generate heavy volumes of traffic—from staff, visitors, delivery trucks, ambulances, and ride services. West King Edward is already a busy arterial with frequent congestion. This will worsen safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and schoolchildren in surrounding blocks. The underground parking provided is insufficient, which will force overflow parking into nearby residential streets.</p> <p>Third, this application undermines the goals of the R1-1 zone, which was carefully designed to support inclusive, family-friendly, low-density neighborhoods. Instead of respecting that intent, we’re being asked to rezone for a large, for-profit, private-pay care facility that will be inaccessible to most seniors in need. This is not a public health investment. It’s a private real estate deal, and it doesn’t align with the city’s vision for equitable, community-serving growth.</p> <p>Fourth, the process has lacked meaningful consultation. Many neighbors learned about the proposal late and had limited opportunity for input. Why wasn’t a smaller-scale facility considered? Why not include community-serving amenities? Why weren’t existing site conditions—including impacts on adjacent homes—more carefully studied? The public hearing should not be the first real point of engagement.</p> <p>And finally, we must consider the precedent this sets. If this rezoning is approved, it opens the door for similar oversized developments all along this corridor. This is not gentle density. It’s overdevelopment, camouflaged as care.</p> <p>We need to be smart and strategic—not reactive. Vancouver can build housing for seniors and families. But it must respect neighborhood context, protect livability, and serve the public interest, not private profit.</p> <p>I respectfully ask Council to reject this rezoning and send a clear message: that good planning includes community voices, balances growth with livability, and leaves no one behind. Thank you.</p>	Valerie Tolsma	Shaughnessy	

Date Received	Time Created	Subject	Position	Content	Author Name	Neighborhood	Attachment
2025-06-19	16:43	CD-1 Rezoning: 1110-1160 West King Edward Avenue	Oppose	<p>For the past 20 years, I’ve lived with my husband, and now our two children, on West 26th Avenue in the house directly behind (and aligned with the centre) of the five lots being considered for rezoning. Our house is about 100 years old and is situated at the very back of our property. We don’t have a backyard or a garage to shield us from the giant building that’s being planned. It will be right next to us, with only the width of the alley between us. When we look out our back windows, we will no longer be able to see the trees, the sky, the clouds and the mountains, as we do now; instead we will see a wall of windows with people staring down on us. As you can imagine, this will greatly diminish our privacy and peaceful enjoyment of our home. This is not something that we can live with, and we’ve unfortunately had to make the difficult decision to move out, if this development goes ahead. My kids are terribly anxious and upset about this. They’ve lived their entire lives in our house and can’t imagine living somewhere else. They also can’t fathom a six-storey building only a few feet away from their bedroom windows.</p> <p>Having said that, the project’s excessive height, inappropriate density, negative impact on our neighbourhood, and displacement of my family, is not my primary concern. I’m here to speak in strong opposition to this rezoning application because I care about our seniors. This proposal claims to address the needs of older adults in our community, but I can tell you from painful, firsthand experience: this is not the kind of care our seniors actually need. My mother is 84 years old. She is currently on Vancouver Coastal Health’s waitlist for long-term care. For the past two months, she has been in the hospital (not in a room, but on a bed in the hallway on the 7th floor of the Blackmore Pavilion at VGH), because there are simply no beds available in the public system.</p> <p>Earlier this year, in January, my family helped my mom move into Arbutus Manor, a private assisted living residence operated by Amica, the same company behind this proposal. Arbutus Manor is a beautiful two-storey facility surrounded by lovely gardens—unlike the monolithic structure being proposed here. Sadly, my mother spent only one night there. She wandered out the next morning in her pajamas and was found at the nearby Safeway. Amica wasn’t willing to give her a second chance. Despite having been assessed as meeting their criteria, and being welcomed to move in, Amica’s Director of Care informed me—apologetically—that they couldn’t meet her needs, and my mom was evicted. That one night cost my family about \$14,000.</p> <p>Incidentally, there was no waitlist to get in to Amica Arbutus. None. We were shown several suites to choose from. So, when the applicant says that this development is urgently needed to meet demand—ask yourselves, demand from whom? Because there is no shortage of luxury options for affluent seniors. What we’re lacking—what families and seniors are desperate for—are publicly-subsidized care beds that are accessible, stable, and humane. Amica and Marcon have applied for rezoning to build this same structure in several locations throughout the city. They have recycled the exact same generic proposal, along with its misleading renderings, without even modifying the design to respond to the individual neighbourhoods. This is a real estate investment disguised as care. It’s enriching shareholders and developers at the expense of our communities. If we approve this rezoning, we’re endorsing a vision of elder care based on exclusivity and profit, not dignity and equity.</p> <p>And if this site isn’t going to serve seniors in a real, equitable way, then it should serve families. These five lots could become affordable townhomes, co-ops, or rental apartments for the missing middle—nurses, teachers, tradespeople—people who are being priced out of our city. We need housing that helps people stay rooted in Vancouver across generations. We want our elected officials to support intergenerational residences that respond to the needs of all members of our community.</p> <p>If you approve this rezoning, you’re not just allowing a height and density increase—you’re setting a precedent: that we’re willing to give up livability and zoning protections to build facilities that do not serve the public, but benefit private investors.</p> <p>Council, I urge you to reject this application. We can do better.</p>	Valerie Tolsma	Shaughnessy	